(Caption of Case) Mary Hester Williams,)) BEFORE THE) PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION) OF SOUTH CAROLINA			
Complainant/)				
v.) COVER SHEET		
)				
Duke Energy (Respondent	Carolinas, LLC,))))	DOCKET NUMBER: 200	<u>9</u> - <u>341</u>	- <u>E</u>	
(Please type or print)					
Submitted by:	Catherine E. He	igel S	el SC Bar Number: 9268			
Address:	526 S. Church S	treet, EC03T	Telephone: <u>704-382-8123</u>		3	
	Charlotte, NC 2	8202 F	ax: <u>70</u>	4-382-5690	0	
			Other:			
NOTE: The	1	eontained herein neither replaces n	Cmail: catherine.heig			
	This form is required	for use by the Public Service Com	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	•		
Other: Test INDUSTRY (C		ial Exhibit of Barbara Yar	brough, Motion for			
☑ Electric	•	☐ Affidavit	Letter	-	Request	
☐ Electric/Gas		Agreement	Memorandum		Request for Certification	
☐ Electric/Telecon	mmunications	Answer	Motion		Request for Investigation	
☐ Electric/Water		Appellate Review	Objection		Resale Agreement	
☐ Electric/Water/	Геlecom.	Application	Petition		Resale Amendment	
☐ Electric/Water/S	Sewer	☐ Brief	Petition for Recon	sideration	Reservation Letter	
Gas		Certificate	Petition for Rulem	ıaking	Response	
Railroad		Comments	Petition for Rule to	Show Cause	Response to Discovery	
Sewer		Complaint	Petition to Interve	ne	Return to Petition	
☐ Telecommunica	ations	Consent Order	Petition to Intervene	Out of Time	☐ Stipulation	
☐ Transportation		☐ Discovery	Prefiled Testimon	y	Subpoena	
☐ Water		Exhibit	☐ Promotion		☐ Tariff	
☐ Water/Sewer		Expedited Consideration	Proposed Order		Other:	
Administrative	Matter	Interconnection Agreement	Protest			
Other:		Interconnection Amendment	Publisher's Affida	vit		
		Late-Filed Exhibit	☐ Report			

BEFORE THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION OF SOUTH CAROLINA

DOCKET NO. 2009-341-E

In re:	
Mary Hester Williams,)
Complainant/Petitioner v.)) DIRECT TESTIMONY OF) BARBARA G. YARBROUGH) FOR DUKE ENERGY CAROLINAS
Duke Energy Carolinas, LLC,)
Respondent)

1 Q. PLEASE STATE YOUR NAME, ADDRESS, AND POSITION WITH DU	KE
--	----

- 2 ENERGY CAROLINAS.
- 3 A. My name is Barbara G. Yarbrough. My business address is 526 South Church
- 4 Street, Charlotte, North Carolina. I am Rates Director for Duke Energy Carolinas,
- 5 LLC (referred to hereinafter as "Duke Energy Carolinas" or the "Company"). I have
- 6 responsibility for assisting in the development, implementation, and proper
- administration of the Company's rate schedules and service regulations, as well as
- 8 administering the Public Service Commission of South Carolina's (the
- 9 "Commission") Rules and Regulations. I also am responsible for responding to
- 10 customer inquiries including those directed to the South Carolina Office of
- 11 Regulatory Staff ("ORS").

12 Q. PLEASE STATE BRIEFLY YOUR EDUCATION AND PROFESSIONAL

- 13 **EXPERIENCE.**
- 14 A. I am a graduate of the University of North Carolina at Greensboro. I joined Duke
- Power Company (now known as Duke Energy Carolinas) in 1974, and since 1979 I
- have held several positions in the Company's Rates and Regulatory Affairs
- Department. I have testified before the North Carolina Utilities Commission (the
- "NCUC") and this Commission in complaint and other proceedings.

19 Q. ARE YOU FAMILIAR WITH THE COMPLAINT OF MARY HESTER

- 20 WILLIAMS?
- 21 A. Yes, I am familiar with Ms. Williams' Complaint in this docket as well as the
- similar Complaints that she has filed in Docket No. 2008-90-E and Docket No.
- 23 2009-155-E, both of which the Commission dismissed. Additionally, I have spoken

1		with Ms. Williams on many occasions concerning her electric service account and
2		have been involved in the investigation of concerns she initially directed to the
3		Commission Staff, dating back to 2000.
4	Q.	WHAT IS THE BASIS OF MS. WILLIAMS' COMPLAINT?
5	A.	Although it is somewhat difficult to follow the information provided in Ms.
6		Williams' Complaint, as well as her previous correspondence with Duke Energy
7		Carolinas, the Company understands from the ORS that Ms. Williams has contended
8		for several years that she had been over-charged and that she is entitled to a refund
9		of the amounts she claims to have overpaid Duke Energy Carolinas.
10	Q.	IS THERE ANY EVIDENCE THAT MS. WILLIAMS HAS BEEN OVER
11		CHARGED?
12	A.	No. Ms. Williams was billed for the usage at her residence at rates approved by this
13		Commission. The Company's records indicate that she did not pay for all of the
14		electricity she consumed. As a result, Ms. Williams' service was terminated most
15		recently for nonpayment of bill in May 2006.
16	Q.	PLEASE PROVIDE A BRIEF HISTORY OF MS. WILLIAMS' ACCOUNTS
17		WITH DUKE ENERGY CAROLINAS.
18	A.	As background, the Company's records show that Ms. Williams' service was
19		disconnected in February 2000 with an outstanding bill of \$1,298.83. Records
20		indicate Ms. Williams expressed concern about the meter and disputed the
21		conversion of watts to kilowatts. As a result of her inquiry to the Commission Staff,

a Duke Energy Marketing Specialist met with Ms. Williams at the Company's local

office to explain the metering and conversion process, but Ms. Williams refused to

22

23

accept the Company's explanation. She did admit, however, that she had used six electric space heaters during the winter, which easily explained the higher level of usage during the winter compared to previous years. The Company offer to reconnect Ms. Williams' service upon receipt of a down payment and agreement on a payment plan. No agreement was reached and this information was conveyed to the Commission Staff in August 2001 after Ms. Williams made an informal complaint.

8 Q. DID MS. WILLIAMS EVER HAVE SERVICE RESTORED?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

A.

Yes. Ms. Williams had service for a period in 2005-2006. Following payment of the outstanding bill and deposit, service was restored in February 2005. Once service was restored, Ms. Williams made no payments on the account. The service was disconnected for nonpayment in April 2005 and the final bill, after applying deposit and interest was \$525.28. In May 2005, Ms. Williams contacted the ORS for assistance in getting power restored. The service was restored on May 12, 2005 after payment of \$267.51, and a partial payment of the deposit. Again, sufficient payments were not made and service was disconnected in July 2005. In December 2005, arrangements were made to restore service for Ms. Williams, but service was against disconnected for nonpayment in March 2006. It was reconnected briefly, but disconnected again in May 2006. The usage records indicate Ms. Williams likely was continuing to use electric space heaters during the winter months. Although Ms. Williams has made several requests for service since 2006, service has not been restored because Ms. Williams has refused to pay the outstanding bill of \$577.97. The Company did receive a \$25.00 payment in July of 2008, which reduces the

balance to \$552.97. A billing and payment history for 2005-2006 is attached as
 Confidential Yarbrough Exhibit 1.

Q. CAN YOU EXPLAIN WHY MS. WILLIAMS BELIEVES SHE HAS BEEN

OVERCHARGED?

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20 .

21

22

23

A.

I will attempt to provide what I understand from Ms. Williams' correspondence and the discussions I have had with her. Ms. Williams refuses to accept that the Commission-approved residential rate schedule is the correct rate applicable to her usage, and further disputes that the Public Service Commission of South Carolina, not the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission or other entity, has jurisdiction over the rates and service practices of Duke Energy Carolinas in the state of South Carolina. She attempts to use any other price related to electricity that she sees in any publication and tries to correlate it to what she believes her bill should be. For example, she has repeatedly cited the \$4.00 per 1000 kWh block contribution under the NC GreenPower Program from an article in the Charlotte Observer as the appropriate rate for 1000 kilowatt hours of power she used. Attached to her Complaint is another example of an inappropriate calculation. She extracted the amount for a 1000 kilowatt hour per month bill from a newspaper notice related to North Carolina rates and subtracted this amount from what she was billed in an attempt to illustrate an overcharge on an amount that she claims to have paid but did not pay. Duke Energy Carolinas does not understand the other calculations on this page. First, North Carolina rates are not applicable in South Carolina. Second, her actual usage far exceeded the 1000 kilowatt hours on which the North Carolina typical bill example was based. We believe that one other key factor in Ms.

1		Williams' belief that she has been overcharged is that she does not understand the
2		impact on her electric bill of using electric space heaters and the significant increase
3		in usage that these appliances cause.
4	Q.	HAS MS. WILLIAMS ALLEGED THAT DUKE ENERGY CAROLINAS
5		HAS VIOLATED THE LAW?
6	A.	Yes, but nothing she has cited is relevant to her request for retail electric service in
7		South Carolina. With the exception of South Carolina Code of Laws Section 3-3-10,
8		which has nothing to do with electric service, all of the references in her complaint
9		are from federal law, the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, or North Carolina
10		law.
11	Q.	WHAT WOULD BE REQUIRED FOR MS. WILLIAMS TO RE-
12		ESTABLISH HER ELECTRIC SERVICE ACCOUNT?
13	A.	Ms. Williams would need to pay the outstanding bill of \$552.75, plus a deposit of
14		\$500.00 or provide a satisfactory guarantor. This deposit request is less than the
15		highest two consecutive months of her previous usage at current rates.
16	Q.	WHAT ACTION DOES DUKE ENERGY CAROLINAS RECOMMEND
17		THE COMMISSION TAKE ON MS. WILLIAMS' COMPLAINT?
18	A.	Duke Energy Carolinas recommends that the Commission reject Ms. Williams'
9		complaint and rule in favor of the Company. Further, the Company requests that the
20		Commission encourage Ms. Williams to seek assistance from appropriate federal,
21		state and local agencies to help pay her power bill arrearages and the deposit
22		required to reconnect service to her residence.

- 1 Q. DOES THIS CONCLUDE YOUR PRE-FILED DIRECT TESTIMONY?
- 2 A. Yes, it does.

Confidential Yarbrough Exhibit 1

REDACTED

BEFORE THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION OF SOUTH CAROLINA

DOCKET NO. 2009-341-E

In re:	
Mary Hester Williams,)))
Complainant/Petitioner v.) MOTION FOR CONFIDENTIAL TREATMENT
Duke Energy Carolinas, LLC,))
Respondent)

NOW COMES Duke Energy Carolinas, LLC (hereinafter "Duke Energy Carolinas" or the "Company"), pursuant to 26 S.C. Code Ann. Regs. 103-804(Y)(2)(Cum. Supp. 2008) and Commission Order No. 2005-226, "ORDER REQUIRING DESIGNATION OF CONFIDENTIAL MATERIALS," with its motion that certain of the information contained in the exhibits of Company Witness Barbara G. Yarbrough be treated and maintained as confidential.

The exhibit appended to Ms. Yarbrough's testimony that is identified as "Yarbrough Confidential Exhibit 1" contains confidential customer information that is personal to Ms. Williams. The Company requests, therefore, that the Commission grant the Company's request for confidential treatment pursuant to 26 S.C. Code Ann. Regs. 103-804(Y)(2)(Cum. Supp. 2008).

WHEREFORE, the Company requests that the Commission afford confidential treatment to Yarbrough Confidential Exhibit 1 and grant such other relief as the Commission deems just and proper.

This, the 31st day of August 2009.

Catherine E. Heigel

Associate General Counsel

Duke Energy Carolinas, LLC

526 S. Church Street, EC03T

Charlotte, North Carolina 28202

Tel: 704-382-8123

Email: catherine.heigel@duke-energy.com

ATTORNEY FOR DUKE ENERGY CAROLINAS, LLC

BEFORE THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION OF SOUTH CAROLINA

DOCKET NO. 2009-341-E

In re:		
)	
Mary Hester Williams,)	
)	
Complainant/Petitioner)	
v.) CERTIFICA	TE OF SERVICE
)	
Duke Energy Carolinas, LLC,)	
)	
Respondent)	

I hereby certify that a copy of Duke Energy Carolinas, LLC's (1) Direct Testimony and Confidential Exhibit of Barbara Yarbrough, and (2) Motion for Confidential Treatment have been served by electronic transmittal or by depositing a copy in the United States Mail, first class postage prepaid, properly addressed to:

Shannon Bowyer Hudson, Esq. Office of Regulatory Staff 1401 Main Street, Suite 900 Columbia, SC 29201

Ms. Mary Hester Williams 305 California Street York, SC 29745

This, the 31st day of August 2009.

Catherine E. Heigel

Associate General Counsel

Duke Energy Corporation 526 S. Church Street, EC03T

Charlotte, North Carolina 28202

Tel: 704-382-8123

Email: catherine.heigel@duke-energy.com